COPY

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement was filed on September 17, 2003 and Applicants respectfully request that a copy of an initialed PTO-1449 form for this IDS be returned with the next office action.

Applicants' representative wishes to thank Examiners Lay and Hjerpe for the courtesy extended during the in-person interview on February 8, 2006. The substance of the interview is reflected in the remarks herein.

Claims 9, 22 and 23 were objected to because of certain informalities. Applicants have amended these claims based on the suggestions kindly made by the Examiner and withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because of an alleged lack of support for the "same screen" feature. Claims 1-5 and 7-23 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because of the "same screen" feature.

As discussed at the interview, the "same screen" feature is fully supported by the original disclosure and the recitation of this feature in the claims does not make the claims indefinite. In particular, Figure 4 shows an exemplary displayed listing in which thumbnail images for 3D images and for 2D images are displayed on the same screen. Figures 9-11 are referenced in an explanation of how the display of thumbnail images is generated. See page 13, line 27 et seq. In particular, Figure 11 is a flowchart illustrating an example procedure of displaying a list of thumbnails using retained thumbnail image data. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the "same screen" feature is fully supported by the original disclosure and that the original disclosure provides an explanation of an example methodology for generating this display.

At the suggestion of Examiners Lay and Hjerpe, a sentence has been inserted after the reference to Figure 4 in the paragraph of the specification beginning at page 7, line 3 to describe that the procedure for displaying the thumbnails shown in Figure 4 is explained later in the specification with reference to Figures 9-11.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-5 and 7-23 based on 35 U.S.C. Section 112 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, 14, 15,[1] 19-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as allegedly being "anticipated" by Mori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,358).

Claim 1 is directed to an image display device comprising "shrunken image displaying means for displaying a list comprising said shrunken image created by said three-dimensional shrunken image creating means and said shrunken image created by said two-dimensional shrunken image creating means on a same screen of said display portion." As shown in Figure 4 of the subject application in connection with a non-limiting, example embodiment, both a shrunken image created by a three-dimensional shrunken image creating means and a shrunken image created by a two-dimensional shrunken image creating means can be viewed at the same time. "Identification information indicative of which of said three-dimensional image data and said two-dimensional image data was used to create the shrunken image" can be provided (claim 8) so that a user can recognize whether the shrunken image was created by the two- or three-dimensional shrunken image creating means.

In contrast, in Mori et al. thumbnail image 950 of the panoramic image and thumbnail image 960 of the stereoscopic image are displayed in different screens as shown in Figure 20. Because thumbnail image 950 of the panoramic image and thumbnail image 960 of the stereoscopic image are displayed on different screens, these thumbnails of Mori et al. are clearly not displayed on a same screen of the display portion as specified in claim 1. Consequently, operation of Mori et al. is disadvantageous because an operation for switching screens is needed for viewing thumbnails 950 or 960. Because Mori et al. does not disclose the shrunken image

[1] Claims 14 and 15 are not identified in the statement of the rejection on page 5 of the office action. However, these claims are treated in the body of the rejection on page 11.

displaying means of claim 1, Mori et al. cannot anticipate claim 1 or its dependent claims 2, 5 and 7-9.

Claim 10 is directed to an image display method comprising "a shrunken image displaying step of displaying a list comprising said shrunken image created in said three-dimensional shrunken image creating step and said shrunken image created in said two dimensional shrunken image creating step on a same screen." As explained above in connection with claim 1, in Mori et al., thumbnail image 950 of the panoramic image and thumbnail image 960 of the stereoscopic image are displayed on different screens. Consequently, Mori et al. does not disclose the claimed shrunken image displaying step in which a shrunken image created in a three-dimensional shrunken image creating step and a shrunken image created in a two dimensional shrunken image creating step are displayed on a same screen. As such, Mori et al. does not anticipate claim 10.

Independent claim 11 is directed to an image display device in which a display of thumbnail images comprises "a mixed display in which thumbnail images for both two-dimensional images and three-dimensional images are displayed at the same time." In Mori et al., thumbnail image 950 of the panoramic image and thumbnail image 960 of the stereoscopic image are displayed on different screens. There is no disclosure of a mixed display as claimed. Consequently, claim 11 and its dependent claims 19-21 and 23 are believed to be allowable over Mori et al.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Mori et al. Mori et al. is deficient with respect to claim 11, from which claims 12 and 13 depend, for the reasons noted above. Consequently, even assuming for the sake of argument that features of the thumbnail images set forth in claims 12 and 13 are disclosed or suggested by Mori et al., claims 12 and 13 would still not have been obvious over Mori et al.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Mori et al. in view of Takiguchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,868,192). Takiguchi et al. is applied in the office action for its description of cropping a section of target image. *See* 5/17/05 Office Action, page 7. Takiguchi does not remedy the deficiencies of Mori et al. with respect to claim

COPY

1, from which claim 3 depends. As such, even assuming for the sake of argument that Mori et al. were forcedly combined with Takiguchi et al., the subject matter of claim 3 would not have resulted.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Mori et al. in view of the IEEE dictionary. However, even assuming the image data of Mori et al. is considered to be "bitmap data", the subject matter of claim 4 would not result because of the above-noted deficiencies of Mori et al., which deficiencies are not remedied by the IEEE dictionary.

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: Michael J. Shea

Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100